

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 2, 2009. Claims 18-28 are presented for examination, of which Claims 18 and 23 are in independent form. Claims 18, 21 and 23 have been amended to define more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 18, 19, 23-25 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0153597 (Kanai et al.) in view of U.S. Patent 6,732,218 (Overtoom et al.), and Claims 21, 22, 26 and 27, as unpatentable over *Kanai* in view of *Overtoom* and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0172223 (Ying et al.).

Applicant submits that the independent claims, together with their dependent claims, are patentable from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

The nature of the present invention and *Kanai* have been adequately discussed in previous papers, and it is not believed necessary to repeat that discussion in full.

Claim 18 is directed to an information processing apparatus which has, among other features, "a USB device controller connectable with a USB host apparatus, which always assumes a host role, for controlling communication between the connected USB host apparatus and the information processing apparatus", and a "USB host controller connectable with a USB device apparatus, which is different from the USB host apparatus, for controlling communication between the connected USB device apparatus and the information processing apparatus". The claim also recites a "connection unit having a

plurality of connectors, wherein each connector is for the USB host apparatus and the USB device apparatus”.

These features are not believed to be disclosed or suggested in *Kanai* and *Overtoom*, considered separately or in any permissible combination.

Applicant submits again that each connector in *Kanai* can be, and always is, connected to only one type of apparatus, either a USB host apparatus or a USB device apparatus (*see para. [0003], [0013] and [0042]*). In addition, a transceiver connects a host/device controller with a device/host connector and serves merely to transmit signals (*see para. [0042] and [0043]*, for example). Therefore, *Kanai* is not believed to disclose or suggest “a connection unit having a plurality of connectors, wherein each connector is for the USB host apparatus and the USB device apparatus,” as recited in Claim 18.

Overtoom does not remedy the deficiency noted above. As Applicant understands, *Overtoom* relates to a USB hub that is compatible with the On-the-Go (OTG) supplement to the USB 2.0 specification to enable dual-role devices to be connected with other devices (*see Abstract*). Specifically, the USB hub has a number of A ports or connectors through which one or more OTG device apparatuses can be connected (and possibly a B port or connector through which a PC can be connected) (*see col. 3, lines 30-46*). The USB hub allows one of the device apparatuses connected to it to assume a host role and enables the communication from this device apparatus to other downstream device apparatuses also connected to the USB hub (*see col. 3, lines 9-14*).

First of all, the USB hub is clearly not an information processing apparatus that needs to exchange processing data with the apparatuses connected to it but merely a connection apparatus that facilitates communication among the apparatuses connected to it.

Furthermore, even if a device apparatus may sometimes assume a host role according to the OTG supplement, a device apparatus is not a host apparatus which always assumes a host role. In addition, an A connector in *Overtoom* is always used to connect to such a device apparatus, while a B connector is always used to connect to a host apparatus. Therefore, *Overtoom* is not believed to disclose or suggest “a connection unit having a plurality of connectors, wherein each connector is for the USB host apparatus [which always assumes a host role] and the USB device apparatus [which is different from a USB host apparatus],” as recited in Claim 18.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, Claim 18 is believed patentable over *Kanai* and *Overtoom*, considered separately or in any permissible combination.

Independent Claim 23 is a method claim corresponding to apparatus Claim 18, and is believed to be patentable over *Kanai* and *Overtoom* for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 18.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or the other of the independent claims, and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P Diana/
Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800

FCHS_WS 4561364_1.DOC